

Addendum to: Symmetries of the Bosonic String S-Matrix

Gregory Moore¹

moore@castalia.physics.yale.edu

Dept. of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT

and

moore@charm.rutgers.edu

Dept. of Physics, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ

In a previous paper we showed that bracket relations uniquely fix the tree-level bosonic string S -matrix for $N \leq 26$ particle scattering. In this note we extend the proof to N -particle scattering for all N .

January 19, 1994

¹ On leave of absence from Yale University.

1. Introduction

In a previous paper [1] we argued that a certain set of relations on bosonic string S -matrix elements, which we called bracket relations, are an expression of spontaneous symmetry breaking of large underlying symmetry algebras in string theory. Moreover, we argued that these relations uniquely determine the tree-level bosonic string S -matrix up to a choice of string coupling.

The latter claim is a mathematically precise statement capable of rigorous proof. A technical point restricted our discussion to N -particle scattering for $N \leq 26$. In this note we overcome this technical point with a simple trick and extend the discussion of [1] to N -particle scattering for all N .

2. Uniqueness theorem

Let us recall the main statement of [1]. Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ be the CFT for the open bosonic string in $\mathbb{R}^{1,25}$. We will allow momenta and polarization tensors to be complex. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the ghost number 1 BRST cohomology. $\mathcal{H}$ is a representation of the complexified Poincaré group $\mathcal{P}_{26} \equiv \mathbb{C}^{26} \ltimes O(26, \mathbb{C})$. If a linear function $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfies three axioms and the “bracket relations” then it is uniquely determined up to an overall constant c_N . The axioms are: P1: *Poincaré invariance*. P2: *Analytic structure*. As an analytic function $\mathcal{A}$ is meromorphic in the invariants $s_{ij} = p_i \cdot p_j$. It has poles in $s_{ij} \Leftrightarrow p_I^2 \in \{2, 0, -2, -4, \dots\}$ for some momentum p_I in an intermediate channel in some dual diagram. $\mathcal{A}$ is a polynomial in the remaining relativistic invariants. P3: *Regge Growth*. In the limit that some $s_{ij} \rightarrow \infty$, holding other independent invariants fixed, the amplitude behaves as $\mathcal{A} \sim \alpha s_{ij}^\beta$.

The bracket relations state that if J is a ghost number 1 BRST class of momentum q and if V_i are BRST classes of momenta p_i such that J is mutually local w.r.t all the p_i (true iff $q \cdot p_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ in the standard background), and if $q + \sum p_i = 0$ we have an identity

$$\sum_i (-1)^{q \cdot p_2 + \dots + q \cdot p_i} \mathcal{A}(V_1, \dots, \{J, V_i\}, \dots V_N) = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

where we have introduced the “on-shell BV bracket” [2]

$$\{\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2\} = \oint_z dw (b_{-1} \mathcal{O}_1(w)) \mathcal{O}_2(z) \quad . \quad (2.2)$$

In [1] we were only able to prove our theorem for $N \leq 26$ for the following reason.

3. Problem

First recall a few facts about M -particle scattering in d dimensions. Suppose $p_i \in \mathbb{C}^d, i = 1, \dots, M$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^M p_i = 0$. Consider the $O(d)$ invariants $s_{ij} = p_i \cdot p_j$. These are not all algebraically independent, both because the momenta add to zero, and, possibly, because the p_i are confined to d -dimensions. The number of algebraically independent invariants s_{ij} is:

$$\begin{aligned} Md - \frac{1}{2}d(d+1) & \quad \text{for } M \geq d \\ \frac{1}{2}M(M-1) & \quad \text{for } M \leq d+1 \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

For $M \leq d$ a set of algebraically independent invariants can be chosen to be, for example, s_{ij} for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq M-1$. For $M \geq d+1$ the story is more complicated. For example, since any set of $d+1$ momenta is linearly dependent, $\det \Delta = 0$ where Δ is any $(d+1)$ -dimensional minor of the matrix (s_{ij}) . Geometrically, the s_{ij} must lie on a variety $\mathcal{V}[M, d] \subset \mathbb{C}^{M(M+1)/2}$ of dimension (3.1). We will refer to invariants s_{ij} where $i \neq j$ as “kinematic invariants.” (For example, we might take these to be s, t for 4-particle scattering.)

Writing bracket relations requires finding special configurations of momenta. Given such configurations one uses Lorentz invariance and analyticity to deduce identities for all scattering configurations. In particular, to write a bracket relation for N -particle scattering amplitudes in d noncompact dimensions we must find momenta $p_1, \dots, p_N \in \mathbb{C}^d$ such that, if we define $q \equiv -\sum p_i$ then

$$p_i^2 = 2 - 2n_i \tag{3.2a}$$

$$(p_i + q)^2 = \left(\sum_{j:j \neq i} p_j \right)^2 = 2 - 2\tilde{n}_i \tag{3.2b}$$

$$p_i \cdot p_j = z_{ij} \tag{3.2c}$$

where the levels $n_i, \tilde{n}_i, i = 1, \dots, N$, and an algebraically independent set of kinematic invariants for N -particle scattering, z_{ij} ($i \neq j$), have been specified. The number of available independent variables in (3.2) is the number of invariants for $N+1$ particle scattering. Therefore we may compare the number of equations and the number of independent variables as follows:

	$N \leq d$	$N > d$
#Equations	$\frac{1}{2}N(N+1)$	$Nd + N - \frac{1}{2}d(d+1)$
#Independent Variables	$\frac{1}{2}N(N+1)$	$Nd + d - \frac{1}{2}d(d+1)$

For $N \leq d$ a solution to (3.2) will exist [1]. Evidently, for $N > d$, a given current J can only give relations between amplitudes for values of kinematic invariants that lie on a codimension $N - d$ subvariety of the manifold of allowed invariants. Of course, an infinite number of subvarieties will be covered by using the infinite number of currents J at different mass levels. In conjunction with analyticity and growth conditions these relations might well fully determine the amplitudes. Unfortunately, this is difficult to prove, except in special cases (e.g. 4-particle scattering in $d = 3$).

H. Verlinde and E. Witten pointed out an error in our first attempt to circumvent this problem.

4. Fix

We simply embed the CFT $\mathcal{C}_1$ of $\mathbb{R}^{1,25}$ into a larger CFT $\mathcal{C}_2$ in such a way that the cohomology and amplitudes of $\mathcal{C}_1$ are embedded in those of $\mathcal{C}_2$. This can be done, e.g., by taking $\mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{1+E,25+E}) \otimes_{i=1}^E [\langle \xi_i, \eta_i \rangle \cap \ker(\oint \eta_i)]$, where $\langle \xi_i, \eta_i \rangle$ are anticommuting $(0,1)$ -systems, and $Q_2 = \oint c(T^{26+2E} + T^{\xi, \eta}) + c\partial cb$ is the differential.² If $\iota : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ is the embedding then $\iota Q_1 = Q_2 \iota$, so we have a map on cohomology, $\iota_* : \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{C}_1) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Q_2}(\mathcal{C}_2)$.

Scattering amplitudes in the theory $\mathcal{C}_2$ are defined by integrated vertex-operator correlators, with an insertion of $\prod_{i=1}^E \xi(z_i)$ to soak up the ξ_i, η_i zero-modes. As in the standard Friedan-Martinec-Shenker construction of covariant superstring amplitudes, the density is independent of the location of the points z_i for amplitudes of states in the “little Hilbert space” defined by $\oint \eta_i = 0$. For the same reason, the amplitude is a function on the cohomology $\mathcal{H}_{Q_2}(\mathcal{C}_2)$. It follows from the integral representation for the correlators that if $V_i \in \mathcal{H}_{Q_1}(\mathcal{C}_1)$ then

$$\mathcal{A}(V_1, \dots, V_N)_{\mathcal{C}_1} = \mathcal{A}(\iota_*(V_1), \dots, \iota_*(V_N))_{\mathcal{C}_2} \quad . \quad (4.1)$$

A corollary of (4.1) is that $\text{Ker}(\iota_*) = 0$. (4.1) will not hold at higher genus.

² The choice of signature of the additional space is unimportant to our present considerations because we work with complex momenta. It is preferred from other points of view. Indeed, H. Ooguri and C. Vafa noted that, with the above choice of signature, if $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1+E,25+E}$ satisfy $v_i \cdot v_j = 0$ then we can add $Q_2 \rightarrow Q_2 + \Delta Q$, with $\Delta Q = \sum_{j=1}^E i \oint \xi_j v_j \cdot \partial X$ such that $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{C}_1) \cong \mathcal{H}_{Q_2+\Delta Q}(\mathcal{C}_2)$.

Consider the BRST classes in $\mathcal{H}_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} ce^{ip \cdot X} & \quad p^2 = 2 \\ ic\zeta \cdot \partial X e^{iq \cdot X} & \quad q^2 = \zeta \cdot q = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $p, q, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}^{26+2E}$. Let $\mathcal{H}' \subset \mathcal{H}_2$ be the smallest subspace containing these classes and invariant under the bracket. We have $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{C}_1) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Q_2}(\mathcal{C}_2)$. The first inclusion follows from the no-ghost theorem [1]. Both inclusions are proper.

Lemma. $\mathcal{A}' : (\mathcal{H}')^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfies axioms P1,P2,P3.

Proof: P1 is a consequence of the $\mathcal{P}_{26+2E}$ invariance of $\mathcal{H}'$ and of the OPE. P2: Although $\mathcal{H}'$ is a proper subspace of $\mathcal{H}_2$, since $\mathcal{H}'$ is closed under bracket we will not generate any states outside this space by factorization. P3 may be proved from the integral representation for the amplitudes in exactly the same way as for the amplitudes of $\mathcal{C}_1$. ♠

In $\mathcal{H}'$ there is “enough room” to solve (3.2)for $N \leq 26 + 2E$. Therefore, we can apply the same argument as in [1] to conclude that $\mathcal{A}'$ is uniquely fixed up to a constant c_N . Now, $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}'$, so by (4.1) the “physical” amplitudes $\mathcal{A} : (\mathcal{H})^{\otimes N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are determined *a fortiori*. Of course, E is arbitrary so the argument applies to all N . Thus, by enlarging the set of amplitudes one finds a closed set of relations which determine all amplitudes. Exactly this style of argument was used to establish the uniqueness theorem for closed strings in [1].

5. Conclusion

One unsatisfactory aspect of this argument is that we cannot adopt a purely axiomatic approach to determining the $N > 26$ amplitudes in strict analogy to the $N \leq 26$ case in [1]. The reason is that it is not obvious that the axioms on $\mathcal{A}$ imply the extension $\mathcal{A}'$ satisfies the same axioms. Thus, in our Lemma we have to appeal to the explicit integral representations for $\mathcal{A}'$ to establish axioms $P2, P3$.

In our search for a universal spacetime gauge principle we are led to the general construction of tensoring an on-shell background by a $c = 0$ CFT. It is intriguing that in searching for a universal worldsheet gauge principle N. Berkovits and C. Vafa used a similar (albeit more intricate) construction [3].

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank T. Banks, J. Distler, B.Lian, S. Shenker, and G. Zuckerman for useful discussions. I would also like to thank the Rutgers Physics Dept. for hospitality. This work is supported by DOE grants DE-AC02-76ER03075, DE-FG02-92ER25121, DE-FG05-900ER40559, and by a Presidential Young Investigator Award.

References

- [1] G. Moore, “Symmetries of the bosonic string S -matrix,” hep-th/9310026
- [2] B. Lian and G. Zuckerman, “New perspectives on the brst algebraic structure of string theory,” (hep-th/9211072) Commun. Math. Phys. **154**613 (1993).
- [3] N. Berkovits and C. Vafa, “On the Uniqueness of String Theory,” HUTP-93/A031, KCL-TH-93-13; hep-th/9310170